IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND NORTHERN DIVISION

- - - - - - - X

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v. : Criminal No. 14-00002-JFM

RICHARD LEE,

Defendant. : February 5, 2014

----x Baltimore, Maryland

HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE BETH P. GESNER, Judge

APPEARANCES: MARK CROOKS, Esq.

Office of the United States Attorney

6500 Cherrywood Lane

Suite 400

Greenbelt, Maryland 20770 On Behalf of the Government

JOSH TREEM, Esq. EMILY LEVINSON, Esq.

Brown, Goldstein, Levy, LLP 120 East Baltimore Street

Suite 1700

Baltimore, Maryland 21202 On Behalf of the Defendant

Audio Operator: Jill Klein

Transcription Company: CompuScribe

5100 Forbes Boulevard

Suite 101

Lanham, Maryland 20706

(301) 577-5882

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

$\underline{I} \underline{N} \underline{D} \underline{E} \underline{X}$

2

	<u>Page</u>
Court Reads Charges	4
Qualification of the Defendant	6
Argument on Behalf of the Government By Mark Crooks, Esq.	7
Argument on Behalf of the Defendant By Joshua Treem, Esq.	10
Further Argument on Behalf of the Government By Mark Crooks, Esq.	24
Further Argument on Behalf of the Defendant By Joshua Treem, Esq.	27
Comments by the Court	33
Comments on Behalf of the Defendant By Joshua Treem, Esq.	37
Comments on Behalf of Pretrial Services By Alicia LaRue	41
Comments on Behalf of the Government By Mark Crooks, Esq.	42
Ruling of the Court Regarding Detention	45
Court and Third-Party Custodian Re. Responsibilities	48
Court and Defendant Re. Conditions of Release	49

KEYNOTE: "---" indicates inaudible in the transcript
"*" indicates phonetically spelled in the transcript

20

21

22

23

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE CLERK: -- resumes in session. The Honorable 3 Beth P. Gesner presiding. 4 THE COURT: Please be seated. 5 MR. CROOKS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Crooks. 7 MR. CROOKS: This is United States versus Richard 8 Mark Crooks for the Government. And it is Case No. JFM-14-02. And the two case agents, Patricia Teckle* and Stacy 10 Bradley, they are actually sitting behind the defense table. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. 12 Good afternoon, Mr. Treem. 13 MR. TREEM: Yes. Good afternoon, Your Honor. 14 Joshua Treem and Emily Levinson on behalf of Richard Lee, who 15 is seated at counsel table to my right. 16 THE COURT: Thank you. Good afternoon to all of 17 you. 18 Mr. Lee, we are --- appearance. And the purpose of

this proceeding is to tell you what the charges are, tell you what your rights are, and to discuss your release status pending your next court appearance.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

24 THE COURT: And I gather you have reviewed the 25 superseding indictment with Mr. Lee, Mr. Treem?

1 MR. TREEM: Yes, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: I am not going to read the entire 3 indictment to you, Mr. Lee, but I want to make sure you know what the charges in each count are. 5 You are charged in count one of the indictment, superseding indictment, with transportation with intent to 7 engage in criminal sexual activity. The maximum penalty for count one is 15-year minimum mandatory, 30-year maximum term. 9 What that means -- is that correct, Mr. Crook? 10 MR. CROOK: I am sorry. I had put a corrected speedy trial form in front of you, Your Honor. And I am not 11 sure if --12 13 THE COURT: Oh. I am looking at the old one. Okay. I stand corrected, Mr. Lee. 15 Count one of the indictment, the maximum term is up to life imprisonment with a ten-year minimum mandatory, \$1 million fine, and lifetime supervised release that would follow 17 18 any period of incarceration. 19 The minimum mandatories that I referred to, in 20 essence, are required minimums that the Court has to sentence you on with some exceptions. And then the maximum allowed is 21 22 the life, as it relates to count one. 23 Counts two and three. Count two of the indictment, you are charged with a violation of Title 18 Section 2423. I

am sorry. Counts two and three in the indictment charge you

with two separate counts of violation of Title 18 of the United States Code Section 2252(a)(2); that is, receipt of child pornography. The maximum penalty for each of those two counts is a five-year minimum mandatory term, a ten-year maximum term, a lifetime supervised release, and a five each of \$250,000.

Count four of the indictment appearing at page eight charges you with aggravated identity theft in violation of Title 18 of the United States Code Section 1028(a). The maximum penalty for that offense is a two-year consecutive term that would be imposed to serve after any other sentence that were imposed.

Count five of the indictment charges you with production of a visual depiction of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct in violation of Title 18 of the United States Code Section 2251(a). The maximum term for that offense is a 15-year minimum mandatory term. The maximum allowed is 30 years, a \$250,000, and 5 years of supervised release.

And finally, the indictment includes a forfeiture count, which asks that certain property be forfeited to the government. There is no jail time associated with that forfeiture count.

Do you understand what the charges are and what maximum possible penalties are in the superseding indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: Now, you have the right to remain silent

gaw

```
with respect to the charges. You are not required to make any
   statements. And if you did, it could be used against you. You
  also have the right to have an attorney represent you at all
3
  stages of the proceedings. And if you cannot afford counsel,
   counsel would be appointed for you at no cost to you.
5
6
              Do you understand both of those rights, Mr. Lee?
7
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
8
              THE COURT: And if I could ask you to please stand
9
  and raise your right hand. The clerk is going to swear you in.
10
   And I am going to ask you a few questions.
              (Whereupon, the Defendant was sworn.)
11
12
              THE CLERK: Please state your full name for the
13
   record.
14
              THE DEFENDANT: Richard Lee.
15
              THE CLERK: Thank you.
16
              THE COURT: You can be seated, Mr. Lee.
17
              Can you tell me your age, please?
18
                              Thirty-two, Your Honor.
              THE DEFENDANT:
19
              THE COURT: And the year you were born?
20
              THE DEFENDANT: 1981.
21
              THE COURT: And what is your current address?
22
              THE DEFENDANT: 630 South Wolfe Street, W-o-l-f-e,
23
  Baltimore, Maryland.
24
              THE COURT: Within the last 24 hours, have you had
25
   anything to drink or taken any kind of drugs, prescription or
```

gaw

```
otherwise, that are currently affecting your ability to
   understand these proceedings?
3
              THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: Do you understand everything so far?
4
5
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
6
              THE COURT: And I gather you have been retained,
7
  Mr. Treem.
8
              MR. TREEM: Yes, we have, Your Honor, myself and
9
  Ms. Levinson.
10
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. Very well.
11
              So Mr. Lee, we will assume that counsel seated next
12
   to you will be representing you going forward, unless we are
   told otherwise.
13
14
              And what is the Government's position on release?
              MR. CROOKS: Your Honor, first I want to thank
15
  Alicia LaRue, because she gave me the feedback, I think, that
17
  she didn't have to give. That was helpful to me today, knowing
18
  that Pretrial would take a stance that I informed her was
   different from what Pretrial is advocating. And that is
19
20
   largely because I had given my word to defense counsel prior to
21
   today that if the Defendant would self-surrender and, of
  course, appear with counsel, and also coupled with the fact
23
  that he has known about this investigation for nine months,
  that the parties have tried unsuccessfully to reach an
25
   agreement.
```

1 Those two factors principally militated in favor of the Government on today's date agreeing to release, but with 3 conditions. And I think that is probably -- I am anticipating, based on some feedback I got also from Ms. Levinson and Mr. Treem prior to this hearing, that I think that that 5 discussion will undoubtedly go next. And of course, I would 7 like to be heard on that. 8 I do know that --9 THE COURT: I am not sure I followed you on the last 10 thing you said. 11 MR. CROOKS: Sure. I think we also will have an 12 ultimate disagreement about the conditions of release. 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 MR. CROOKS: But I am not going to belabor that now 15 until it becomes, I think, a better waypoint to talk about 16 that. But I know that these charges to bring rebuttable 17 presumptions in favor of detention. And undoubtedly, I credit 18 Pretrial for relying on those presumptions, but also factoring all the other things they ---. It is not that we don't agree 19 20 with a lot of the arguments made by Ms. LaRue on behalf of 21 Pretrial. We certainly do. There is a lot here that does give 22 pause. 23 The Defendant has shown a capability and a willingness to make counterfeit documents. He does have 25 extensive ties out of state. It is not just to Canada, but

also to Korea and to Austria. In addition to that, he travels out of state, which is not unusual certainly for a person of his socioeconomic background. But there are a lot of things that in totality I credit Pretrial for presenting to the Court.

But this is one of those cases were, A, I gave my word to the defense that if they self-surrendered that I would not advocate for detention. But also, as I said, they have known about this case for a long period of time. We have had the passport since warrants were executed quite some time ago. And for that, I think there are conditions that could be set that would reasonably ensure his return to court.

THE COURT: Do you want to address what you think are appropriate?

MR. CROOKS: Yes, Your Honor. I think there are numerous things that are appropriate. I interpret the Adam Walsh Act as mandating, where these charges are here, as mandating electronic home monitoring. I appreciate the fact that before the hearing the defense gave me a couple Second Circuit District Court cases that I have only just had a chance to take a cursory look at. But I don't see them as binding on the Fourth Circuit.

And even within the body of the cases themselves, they seem to say that they are going counter to the Eighth and Ninth Circuits that have ruled that the per se requirements of the Adam Walsh Act that mandate electronic home monitoring are

18

19

20

21

24

25

not unconstitutional. So I agree with that. 2 So I think as a foundational stepping off point, 3 electronic home monitoring is a necessity. 4 I also think, based on the nature of the crimes, which involve the possession of child pornography, the creation 5 of child pornography, but also the production of counterfeit 7 documents, as well as the posting of back page ads online to facilitate the first counts in the indictment, all of those 9 things also militate in favor of no internet usage in the home 10 and certainly a third-party custody where there would be active accountability by a third person that could ensure compliance 11 12 with the obligations to also return to court. 13 14 one tick to the right, if you will, of confinement. That is, pretty much the full line-up of conditions that are not 15 16

I think that essentially what I am advocating for is detention, but close near thereto that you can accomplish. And I did discuss some of this with Pretrial prior to coming here today.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Treem?

Yes, Your Honor. First, I want, with MR. TREEM: the Court's permission, I just want to respond to the Pretrial Services recommendation of detention. And I appreciate Mr. Crooks's remarks on that regard.

But, first of all, a couple of observations of the I think the bottom line is that the reasons on the

18

19

20

21

25

Case 1:14-cr-00002-JFM Document 17 Filed 02/20/14 Page 11 of 61 11 assessment, page five, of the Pretrial Services report, the reasons, the factors, given for nonappearance just aren't met, even by the body of the two and a half pages of the report. And if the Court will permit me just to go through them 5 quickly. 6 THE COURT: Sure. 7 MR. TREEM: Unverified immigration status. 8 seems to me, seems to be based on the inability of Pretrial 9 Services officers to get a response by now. 10 I think that is right. THE COURT: MR. TREEM: So, I mean, it is not that it is 11 12 unverified. I mean, Dr. Lee, the father, who is present in the 13 courtroom, was interviewed. He said he was naturalized. Richard is his second son. He is naturalized, too. And so 15 there is no -- I mean, the unverified immigration status as 16 somehow a negative factor, I think, is inappropriate.

The nature of the alleged incident offense. Well, with all due respect to the Pretrial Services officer, this is based on the indictment alone, presumably. And she has not had access to obviously the information the Government has, nor information that we have. And I will perhaps address that in a moment. But I think it is fair to say that on a global scale, if you go through the counts of the indictment, it sounds, and I don't mean to belittle the charges at all, but it sounds far worse than it is. And I will get to that in a moment.

Possession of a passport. He doesn't have a passport. It was seized at the time of the search of Mr. Lee's home about ten months ago.

Prior foreign travel. That is associated with business. And what is significant about the prior travel is that it was, the most recent trip, which I believe was to Vienna, Austria, was done at a time when Mr. Lee knew that this investigation was ongoing.

THE COURT: You all are talking about search warrants and when he knew. Can you give me a time frame on --

MR. TREEM: Yes. I believe the search -- Mr. Crooks will certainly correct me if I am wrong. I believe the search of Mr. Lee's home in Baltimore was in March of last year. And it was shortly before that that Mr. Lee traveled overseas and came back from Austrian. His passport was seized along with the computers or computer that allegedly contains the child pornography that is described in the indictment.

Significantly, over the course of the ensuing ten months, there has been no indication at all -- and the Government certainly does not contend that there has been -- any indication that Mr. Lee has engaged in any criminal activity whatsoever, whether associated with these allegations or something different.

So the records to strong foreign ties just is not supported by the record. The business trip was to a startup

company, which is barely in business. Other trips were taken as vacations, as he described to the Pretrial Services officer. There is nothing inherently wrong about that or would suggest a nonappearance.

As Mr. Crooks has said, he self-surrendered, reported to the marshals this morning, pursuant to his being advised that there was an arrest warrant, and has been available over the past ten months to counsel. Whenever counsel needed to speak with Mr. Lee, he was available. There is nothing in his record to suggest nonappearance.

Discrepant mental history, mental health history. I gather the reference to that is some reference to a discrepancy between what Mr. Lee, the father, described as his understanding of the medication taken by Mr. Lee, the son. But regardless, that hardly -- even assuming that that is an accurate description, it hardly supports a claim that somehow Mr. Lee won't show up when required to do so. And it certainly doesn't seem to me the least bit odd that since the searches and knowledge of this investigation might cause some stress, which might require some medication from time to time, and that is what Mr. Lee reported.

Unknown substance abuse history to include prior drug-related arrests. Your Honor, I told Mr. Lee not to answer the question of substance abuse. But since the Pretrial Services officer seems to hold that against him, I feel

gaw

compelled to explain.

At the time of the search warrant, a small amount of a controlled substance was found in the house. Mr. Lee was charged in the state with possession of that drug. The case was stetted. That is his only record. There is no conviction. He was released under cognizance. There is no suggestion that he has been doing anything drug related since. That is the nature and extent of his prior abuse history, if you will.

With respect to the danger to the community, which has to be established by clear and convincing evidence, that is even less supported here. And the prior arrest records I talked about. Discrepant mental history I talked about. And the unknown substance abuse history I talked about. But let me talk about the nature and circumstance of the alleged instant offense, if the Court will indulge me.

But first, let me back up.

The Pretrial Services report does reflect that

Mr. Lee has no prior convictions, if you will, even if you want
to characterize the possession charge as somehow being a
triggering prior record of some kind. He has been gainfully
employed. He has substantial family and personal contacts to
Maryland. His father and brother are here in the courtroom and
have expressed a willingness to act as third-party custodians,
if necessary. He is generally in good health other than
perhaps the stress that this entire matter has brought to bear

on him. He is a naturalized citizen. And there is nothing to suggest in his record that he is a danger other than the charges. So let me kind of get to those, if the Court will permit me.

What is apparent from, I think, even a casual reading of the indictment is that putting aside the charge of receipt of child pornography, all the other charges relate to a single individual, who is identified as T.G. in the indictment. That is the person who is described as a victim.

The indictment, what the indictment doesn't say specifically, but which I think can be inferred, is that at the time Mr. Lee met T.G., she was operating as a prostitute in Baltimore. She lied to him about her age, as reflected in some of the introductory paragraphs. Mr. Lee did not know about her true age or what she represented to be her true age until months later. And the significance of that is that he, if you credit the allegations, he would have traveled to Florida with her believing that she was 19 and not 16.

The crux of this count, count one, kind of turns on the intent allegedly that Mr. Lee had to engage in sex with her in Florida in violation of Florida law. So that is count one. There is no allegation that Mr. Lee was doing this with anyone else. It was just T.G. And I guess the point is that it is the age issue that triggers the crime, not the character of the relationship, which I think is appropriate to describe as

consensual.

There is an allegation that Mr. Lee paid for her services initially, but there is no such allegation of that when they went to Florida. In fact, it is in fact alleged that they continued to have sexual relations there.

So I think it is accurate to say, at least based on this indictment, that one could consider that conduct, whether it constitutes a per se violation or a strict liability violation of Florida law, consensual sexual activity. So, you know, whether or not T.G. can be described as a victim is open to, I would say, significant debate.

As I indicated earlier, Your Honor, the search and seizure of the computers and documents and the passport took place about ten months ago. Again, Mr. Lee was on notice at that point. Again, there is no allegation that he has done anything untoward or inappropriate since that date. The Government has the instrumentalities of the crime charged. They seized computers. They seized his passport. They seized a camera, which I believe they claim is associated with their production count.

Significantly, I think it might be safe to infer that Mr. Lee, because of his education and his ability to be gainfully employed and have some assets, and because he is charged with having produced a false I.D. before, could do it again. That is belied by the fact that he is here. If he were

going to do that, he had every opportunity to do it while the investigation was going on. And the Government is not asking for detention, recognizing that very fact. And I would suggest that there is, from that, there is no evidence that would support by any evidence at all, let alone clear and convincing evidence, that Mr. Lee, in some respects, constitutes a danger to the community.

So I would ask the Court not to detain Mr. Lee, but otherwise do what the Bail Reform Act requires, which is to find the least onerous conditions that would provide some assurance that Mr. Lee would report as directed and not constitute a danger to the community.

You know, contrary to my brother, Mr. Crooks's, remarks about, you know, one tick to the right of detention being an appropriate determination by the Court, we have some arguments to address in that regard, as well. I don't know whether the Court wants to hear those now or not. I guess it may very well turn on whether you want to detain Mr. Lee or not. But I am happy to address those now, if that is what you wish.

THE COURT: I would probably address, because I have to consider whether or not there are conditions of release that adequately address the flight and danger concerns.

MR. TREEM: Okay. Fair enough.

We gave the Court a couple of cases. And

Ms. Levinson and I have not the opportunity to study them in great detail. But we would, for the record, we would argue that that mandatory language in the Adam Walsh statute that comes at the end of, I guess it is, 3142(c)(b)(xiv), if I remember my roman numerals correctly, is unconstitutional on two bases.

One, on its face as a violation of due process, denying Mr. Lee his right to travel without due process, to kind of generalize the argument; and --

THE COURT: I could probably make one observation on this front, Mr. Treem. I did read your cases, and I understand there is some case support for that. I have never been on that side of it. But I would say in this particular case, if I were to set electronically monitoring conditions, it would not be because I felt like I was required to by the statute.

MR. TREEM: Right.

THE COURT: It was because I would believe it would be necessary.

MR. TREEM: Okay. All right. Then let me address that, if I could. I will go right to that, because I know the Court is aware of the arguments, as applied and on its face and that kind of stuff.

Based on what is before Your Honor and based on the Government's presentation and based on what we contend is very much a lack of the substance of what the Pretrial Services

```
officer claims is appropriate for detention, we would argue
   that if the Court is inclined to impose electronically
  monitoring, that it do it consistent with a curfew, that there
3
  is no requirement, based on Mr. Lee's personal situation in
  which he is, again, gainfully employed and which he can live
5
  with his parents, who would act as third-party custodians, that
7
  there is any necessity for a 24/7 requirement for electronic
8
  monitoring.
9
              By the way, I would add here, Your Honor, that in
10
  regard to the electronic monitoring a dedicated phone line has
  already been installed at Mr. Lee's father's residence and is
11
12
   available to be up and running consist with any order that the
13
   Court may wish to impose. But --
14
              THE COURT: Can I ask a question about which
  residence you are proposing? I saw in the Pretrial report --
15
16
              MR. TREEM: Silver Spring residence, Your Honor.
17
              THE COURT: The Link?
18
              MR. TREEM:
                          Yes.
19
              THE COURT: Okay. It said an indication of
   relocating there. So I was not quite sure.
20
21
                               It is that -- Dr. Lee, the father,
              MR. TREEM:
                          Yes.
  travels extensively. And because of the nature of his work, he
23
  is often away from the Silver Spring address for days and
  actually weeks on end. And so he actually has ownership
24
```

interest in other locations. But to act as third-party

custodian for his son, he will reside at 2212 Link in Silver Spring, and that is where his son will be, as well.

What the report doesn't say is that the father and son -- the son works at the father's business in Columbia on a daily basis. So he can provide the kind of constant assurance and custodial assurance that would otherwise be necessary and needed. Mr. Lee has a full-time job. That should continue. There is no reason why it shouldn't. And electronic monitoring is difficult to live with for any extended period of time.

Again, given Mr. Lee's character and conduct throughout this investigative period, we would argue that there is no necessity for the 24/7. Dr. Lee, the father, is prepared to act as the third-party custodian, as we have indicated. Again, the family contacts we think would provide the Court with plenty of assurance. And if you are asking for a more specific definition of the time frame I had in mind, I think it is appropriate that Mr. Lee be allowed to go to work with his father and continue in that regard, and that, if the Court wishes to impose a curfew during which electronic monitoring would be, I guess, on, it should be from 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. And that can be seven days, but that provides, I think, the assurances that the court would need on the one hand and provide Mr. Lee with a certain degree of freedom of movement, which we think the facts of this case certainly permit.

There is still no evidence that he would constitute

a danger to this community even given the allegations of this

case. And in that regard, I would just note, Your Honor,

that -- and again, this is based on the face of the

indictment -- the child pornography that is allegedly on his

computer is dated 2009 and 2010. It is not -- you know, we are

talking about receipt that allegedly happened four years ago or

five years ago.

THE COURT: Are you talking about the ones that are listed in counts two and three?

MR. TREEM: Yes. Yes.

THE COURT: Because I guess the allegation is that 600 images were found. I don't know if those dates correspond to the whole --

MR. TREEM: Well, I would submit, Your Honor, based on what we know, the dates correspond to these two. They are contemporaneous. And so I would submit that there is certainly nothing that we have heard here today which suggests that Mr. Lee received any child pornography at our about or shortly before the time of the search.

And so, you know, to the extent that there was receipt and/or possession, it is -- as I say, it is not contemporaneous. And so that, I think, only serves to highlight what we would argue is the very limited scope of the charges. It is one -- and I hate to use the word victim, because I don't consider T.G. to be a victim in the slightest.

```
But it is just one person and images that were received years
2
   ago.
3
              And I think in light of that and in light of
  Mr. Lee's history and lack of criminal history and other
4
5
  criminal conduct, that if the Court is inclined to impose
   electronic monitoring, that it do it consistent with the curfew
7
  that we have asked for.
8
              But also let me say, Your Honor, I don't want to
  qive up, and I want the record to clearly reflect that we think
10
  that if the Court feels compelled -- we believe that that
  section is unconstitutional both on its face and as applied.
11
12
              THE COURT: Although I gather you would recognize
13
   that if I determined that condition is necessary to address
   flight and danger concerns, that it would not run afoul of
   the -- I mean, I can impose electronic monitoring in any case.
15
16
   Right?
17
              MR. TREEM: Absolutely, Your Honor.
18
              THE COURT:
                          Yes.
19
              MR. TREEM: You are right. You are absolutely
20
           That is true. And I think it is one of the Eight
   right.
21
   Circuit, maybe it was the Eighth or Ninth Circuit cases that
   essentially said that. And, you know, we understand that. And
   we have explained that to Mr. Lee, as well.
24
              I just want to put on the record our position in
```

case the Court were to say: I can't even consider any of this

gaw

| 23 |

```
because --
2
              THE COURT: I hear you.
3
              MR. TREEM: Because I am mandated, I don't have a
4
   choice.
5
              THE COURT: I understand.
6
              MR. TREEM: If the Court will just bear with me one
7
  moment.
8
              (Pause)
9
              MR. TREEM: Unless the Court has any additional
10
  questions, we would submit. Thank you.
11
              THE COURT: So your proposal is for Mr. Lee to go
12
   reside with his parents. --
13
              MR. TREEM: Yes.
14
              THE COURT: -- in the Silver Spring home --
15
              MR. TREEM: Yes, Your Honor.
16
              THE COURT: -- and continue to be able to work.
17
              MR. TREEM: Yes, Your Honor.
18
              THE COURT: Okay. Are there any other aspects of
19
       So you propose that Mr. Lee's father would be a third-
   party custodian.
20
21
                          Yes, Your Honor. And I believe the pre-
              MR. TREEM:
   sentence report reflects, the Pretrial Services report reflects
   the willingness of the father to do that.
24
              THE COURT: Yes, it certainly does.
25
              MR. TREEM: And we would ask that. And the only
```

other thing, Your Honor, I would ask that -- we would hope the Court wouldn't think that electronic monitoring is necessary in this case. But if the Court believes that is so, we would ask that it be limited to, tied to a curfew for Mr. Lee, which would assure that he is home between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m., and that the condition the electronic monitoring be set for that time period; that is, that it not be 24/7.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CROOKS: Your Honor, may the Government be heard on conditions?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. CROOKS: The first thing I want to address is sort of the assessment of what the indictment portends and what the facts show. First off, I am not sure why the defense has engaged in a question of whether she is a victim or not. I don't see that as -- first off, I don't think we used the word victim in the indictment. But the point is that if these are largely strict liability crimes, and more importantly for Your Honor's consider, T.F., who I think Mr. Treem was referring to as T.G., informed Mr. Lee immediately upon arrival in Florida that she was in fact 16, and it was after that information being provided to Mr. Lee from T.F., that he then posted the ads on back page -- and I think that is an important chronology -- and facilitated her prostitution, it is also after that that he facilitated her return to Maryland. And it

is also after that he created counterfeit documents for her, the delivery of which --- in the form of Nino, where he indicated that he knew that her age was that of a minor and that he was hoping to not only commit these crimes, but to portray her as someone that was older than she was, in addition to that, the creation of the photographs.

So I just want that to be absolutely clear, because I think that that is an accurate assessment of what the facts as they are alleged in the indictment are.

The other factor that I would like to address is the fact that it was just argued or suggested that it is a singular incident involving one individual. While that is true in terms of what the Grand Jury credited and found probable cause to return this indictment, it is also true that on the computers and the hard drive recovered from Mr. Lee's apartment were numerous other females, who were unidentified. Well, I shouldn't speak in absolute terms. There are a couple that were identified, who were just over the age of that of a minor, but others, who were unidentified, in poses and activities that unequivocally constitute pornography.

Now, obviously, if they were shown to be minors, there would be obviously a charge commensurate with the one here. So I think it is relevant for Your Honor's consideration, in terms of the community considerations, to know that there are those other photographs, that the agents

are working hard to figure out who those individuals are, and, if they are minors, whether it is determined through a Tanner methodology or from actually identifying those persons, then I am sure the Grand Jury will be asked by my office to consider additional charges. But I think for the immediate concern of the community considerations it is relevant and appropriate for Your Honor to consider that fact.

In addition -- and I did a quick sort of conferral with Special Agent Bradley -- it is somewhat arbitrary that images that were chosen to be reflective in the indictment -- because as we craft these indictments, we don't lay out all 600-plus images. But there were images that were more recent than 2009, 2010, based on the forensic examination that was done not only by the Government's expert, but also as verified and oversaw by an expert that was hired by the defense counsel.

So if Your Honor is inclined to put some temporaral weight to that argument, then I suggest that there are more recent downloads that appear, at least forensically, to be acquired in a more recent time period.

I think that the concern I have with regard to the Silver Spring third-party custodian, I am not saying that that would not be an appropriate person. I guess I would ask the defense to address the fact that they are saying that the dad does leave for extended periods of time, two, three weeks perhaps. So is there a surrogate that comes in during those

```
intervals to serve that function, if dad is leaving for that
  long period of time? And that is also a concern that the
3
   Government has.
4
              But those are the principal issues, based on things
   previously --
5
6
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
7
              MR. TREEM: Can I just address that last point, Your
8
  Honor?
9
              THE COURT:
                          Yes.
10
                          I think it is somewhat -- it can be, I
              MR. TREEM:
   think, appropriately inferred, and I think it also is true,
11
12
   that the father, Dr. Lee, will adjust his schedule to the
13
   commands and requirements of being a third-party custodian, if
  the Court sees fit to impose that. I mean, that is something
15
   that we can manage, I mean he can manage and is willing to
16
  manage to --
17
              THE COURT: Okay.
                                 I mean, generally speaking, my
18
  thought on a third-party custodian is that they would not be
19
   gone for extended periods of time. And if that was necessary,
   then perhaps, you know, another third-party custodian might be
20
   proposed.
21
22
              MR. TREEM: Well, you know, first of all, I don't
  think that is going to happen, because I think in speaking with
  Dr. Lee that he has indicated a willingness to do whatever, as
25
   I said, whatever is appropriate to do as a third-party
```

```
custodian, if that means being around rather than being away
  for extended periods of time, then that is what he is prepared
  to do. That is kind of the short of it.
3
4
              The mother also lives at the residence. The brother
  also lives close by. And if in fact it becomes an issue in
5
  which the father has to leave for extended periods of time, we
7
  would certainly advise the Court and request a modification to
  allow a substitute custodian to be appointed for the duration
9
  of the father's absence from the District of Maryland. And
10
  there are people who are willing to do that. As I said, the
   older brother, who is here and works in the family business, as
11
12
   well, as well as the mother.
13
              THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Treem.
14
              Thank you for your report, Ms. LaRue. Did you have
15
   anything to add?
16
              MS. LaRUE: Could I approach?
17
              THE COURT: Yes.
18
              MS. LaRUE: Thank you.
19
              (Whereupon, a Bench Conference followed, which was
  off the record.)
20
21
              MS. LaRUE: My recommendation obviously is the same.
  However, I just wanted to say that if the Court is inclined to
23
  release the Defendant --- obviously until --- is posted, as
   well as the location monitoring ---
24
25
              THE COURT: --- come up here, too.
```

```
1
              (Whereupon, a Bench Conference follows, which was on
  the record:)
3
              THE COURT: --- at this point --- this issue up here
4
  rather than ---.
5
              --- is applied --- why detention is not
  appropriate --- although --- flight concerns and danger
7
  concerns causes me to get to --- classified as to the right of
   detention or to the left of detention. But those strict
9
   conditions --- only thing they are just talking about there,
  because I think there is an incentive to flee hear, I think
10
  with the ability to flee. And once --- didn't want to put you
11
  on the spot because I didn't know if you had talked with --
13
              MR. TREEM: I have not talked to them about any
  property or surety to be posted. I have not done that. Do you
15
  want me to do that?
16
              THE COURT: Well, I think we are probably --- put it
17
  back on the record at this point. I mean, But right now I
   am --- 24/7 lockdown. And with the phone in place --- Pretrial
18
19
   doesn't have confirmation that it is an available line right
20
   now --- set it up today. And making some property ---
21
              MR. TREEM: Okay. Well, then I would -- I mean, I
  could probably get back to Your Honor on the property, you
23
  know, within 24 hours, if not sooner. But the problem is that,
  you know, I -- I would hope the Court would not be detaining
25
  Mr. Lee while we did that.
```

```
1
              THE COURT: I am detaining him until conditions can
  be put in place.
3
              MR. TREEM: Oh, Your Honor, that's -- I mean, I have
4
  had two cases in which issues like this have come up in the
   past. And each time the Court --
5
6
              THE COURT: Well --- electronic monitoring.
7
              MR. TREEM: Well, okay. But the problem is that he
8
  is being detained because we just can't get to it today.
  \parallelis -- I mean, they can't verify it. The line is there. I mean
10
   --- setting it up. It's on Verizon. It is at their home in
  Silver Spring. And to detain Mr. Lee overnight at the CDF or
11
12
  wherever it is going to be is just totally inappropriate under
13
   those circumstances, because it is really just a function of
  time and the ability of Pretrial to go confirm that that is
14
15
  requiring him to be there.
16
              THE COURT: Well, it is what it is --- I am shocked
17
  the Government is not seeking detention. I respect that that
   was a promise that they once made. And I --- but this is one
18
19
   of the worst set of facts I have seen.
20
              MR. TREEM: Well, with all due respect, Your Honor,
  it is not.
21
22
              THE COURT:
                          That is not what I have seen.
23
              MR. TREEM:
                          Okay.
24
              THE COURT: And, you know, in any other case the
25
   Government could ask for detention --- but I think conditions
```

```
of release ---
2
              MR. TREEM: So then he can't -- an exception to go
3
   to work?
4
              THE COURT: No. I just said 24/7 monitoring.
5
              MR. TREEM: How about going to see me?
6
              THE COURT: I think we could talk about all those
7
  details --- confront the property issue, because I think --
8
              MR. TREEM: Well, give me some idea of what would
9
  satisfy you, Your Honor.
10
              THE COURT: --- his parents have property they are
  willing to post. I think that would address it.
11
12
              MR. TREEM: What about a bond, monetary bond,
  instead?
13
14
              THE COURT: From them?
15
              MR. TREEM: Yes.
16
              THE COURT: I would entertain that. But Pretrial,
17
  of course --- detention.
18
              MR. TREEM: I understand that, but that is not --
19
              THE COURT: --- willing to set conditions, I would
  want their input on what the property was. But I am open to
21
   that. But I think that --
22
              MR. TREEM: But even I attempted that in the next
  two minutes from Lee what he would be willing to do, that is
  still not going to release him tonight?
25
              THE COURT: Well, I don't know if Pretrial ---
```

gaw

```
Pretrial wants the equipment --- if we want to take a break and
  see if we can do that, I don't know the availability of a
  monitoring device in place, so I am happy to take a recess,
  then ask them to come back and ---
5
              MR. TREEM: Well, I would like to know how long that
  is -- yes, I would like to know how long that is going to take.
7
  And I can talk to -- I think that is Pretrial's obligation to
  let us know how long that is going to take verify and what they
9
   have to do about it.
10
              THE COURT: --- what was in place. So I think --
              MR. TREEM: Well, I understand that, and that's
11
   fine. It is. I am just representing that. And in the
13
  meantime I can talk to Dr. Lee about property and/or a bond of
14
   some sort.
15
              THE COURT: As I say, I have an open mind. I
   just ---
16
17
              MR. TREEM:
                          Okay. But I guess what I --
18
              THE COURT:
                          I think we should take --- get in place.
19
              MR. TREEM:
                          That's fine.
20
              THE COURT: So I am happy to take a break from this
21
   and take a few other matters. And then we can recall this when
22
   you are all ready. I will be here.
23
              MR. TREEM: Okay. Fair enough.
24
              THE COURT: Do you want the --
25
              MS. LaRUE:
                          No ---
```

```
(Whereupon, the Bench Conference was concluded.)
 1
2
              THE COURT: Okay, counsel. We are going to take a
3
  recess from this matter and just come back. And whenever you
  are ready to address some of the issues that we talked,
  Mr. Treem, I will be here on other matters.
5
6
              MR. TREEM: Okay. Can Mr. Lee remain here? Because
7
  I may need to confer with him.
8
              THE COURT: Not while we continue -- I mean, you can
9
   confer with him in the marshals' service. But I think they
10
  need to bring -- we cannot have more than one person here.
              MR. TREEM: All right.
11
12
              (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)
              THE COURT: Recall the case of U.S. versus Richard
13
  Lee, JFM-14-0002. Just to resume the hearing that we were
15
  having on release conditions. Let me -- I am prepared to
16
   address some of the things. I gave you a brief comment at the
17
   bench as to where I was headed and I know counsel have looked
18
  into perhaps some other issues with respect to posting of
19
   property.
20
              So let me just make the comments that I have to make
   and then you can tell me what you propose in terms of release.
21
  As I said, I read the indictment, I read the pre-trial report
23
  and I have heard the argument of counsel and understand that
  the defense -- that the Government is not seeking detention
24
25
   which they have the right to do and they have not ---.
```

Of course, the Government cannot detain on their own because of risk of danger. I could detain on the basis of risk of flight sua sponte without the Government's motion. And certainly that is something that I considered based on these facts and circumstances. Notably the Government enjoys the presumption in favor of detention with respect to danger and flight.

A presumption which is rebuttable by the defense and of course the danger presumption is probably not pertinent to the detention issue. Those factors may bear as to conditions of release. With respect to the flight concerns, I think that Mr. Treem has done a very capable job and very compelling job on behalf of his client arguing that conditions of release can be fashioned to address flight concerns and that there are facts and circumstances present that rebut the presumption.

And I think notably the presence and support of Mr. Lee's family, his ties to his family who are local, the fact that he knew about the investigation and is still here some months later, several months later and that he self surrendered today I think are all significant factors. I think pre-trial also has very capably noted the risk of indicia as to flight.

And as I said, I think Mr. Treem has addressed each one of them head on and I think that there remains in fashioning conditions of release, concerns that I have both

with respect of flight and danger that cause me to conclude the various significant conditions of release should be fashioned and addressed.

And with respect to that, let me just explain my reasoning. Mr. -- and I should have noted too, Mr. Lee has no criminal record and that is of course significant in terms of rebutting the presumption. It also I think causes the Court to be concerned given that the allegations in the indictment appear to aberrant(sic) based on his otherwise clean background. So that causes me some concern.

We can all debate what to call the individual named in the indictment, I think Mr. Treem's points are all very well made with respect to the allegations. I think this is a very serious offense. The allegations in the indictment are very substantial. I think the allegations in the indictment clearly establish that while Mr. Lee may not have know that the individual named here, T.F., was a minor at the time that they traveled to Florida, that that was known. It is alleged at the time that Mr. Lee actively engaged in prostituting and including information about that individual on that page as well as additional -- fairly substantial period of time that they continued to interact thereafter.

That is a separate offense from the one that this

Court often sees and that is the possession of child

pornography. And the allegations here is that there was a very

substantial volume of child pornography found, 600 images which in the scheme of what this Court sees is on the high end.

Certainly I understand the Government picks and chooses what to put in the indictment in terms of offenses -- in terms of actual pictures.

Certainly the ones noted and alleged in the indictment are ones that are significant child pornography. I recognize that those two dates are not perhaps current. I accept the Government's proffer that there is more current information but I think notably that at the time of the search in March of 2013, all of those images had been retained for a period of time and that is significant as well.

The penalties involved here are very substantial.

The incentive to flee is very great. Particularly for someone who has no prior record. And certainly why I don't penalize Mr. Lee for having the ability or the fact that he has traveled abroad, that is a reality in terms of assessing the risk of flight.

The fact that he can and has traveled. I understand the Government has a passport and that is of note to me as well. And so all of those circumstances, while as I said, I concluded that the presumption has been rebutted with respect to flight or all of the facts that I think militate in favor of very stringent conditions of release.

Frankly, this is maybe even inconsistent with things

```
that I have done in the past, which the Government has sought
               So it is mindful of the fact that Mr. Lee has
   detention.
  substantial family ties, responsible individuals available to
3
  be a third party custody. That is of note to me as well.
   Dr. Lee is willing to act as a third party custodian.
5
6
              I had indicated in the prior hearing to counsel that
7
  I did think that the posting of some type of property or bond
  was appropriate as well given the risk of flight and I don't
9
   know if counsel has had the opportunity to look into that.
10
                         I have, Your Honor. But let me just if I
              MR. TEEM:
  might perhaps just add some other I think facts with respect to
11
12
   the Court's comment that -- if I wrote this down, talk about
13
   substantial penalties providing the incentive to flee.
14
              In addition to Mr. Lee knowing about the
15
   investigation, since the time of the search, and the fact I
16
   think at one point he got a target letter, so it became
17
   actively known to him.
18
              THE COURT: Was that before or after the search
19
   warrant?
20
                        I think it was just after the search
              MR. TEEM:
21
   warrant.
22
                           It was at the time of the warrant.
              MR. CROOKS:
                         The time of the search warrant.
23
              MR. TEEM:
24
                          That day?
              THE COURT:
25
              MR. CROOKS:
                           It was given to the agents to give to
```

```
him that day.
2
              MR. TEEM: So that day. Okay. In addition to that,
  this indictment was originally returned I think on January 2
  and it was sealed while counsel were engaging in some
5
   additional discussions. Mr. Lee was aware of that -- that
6
   fact.
7
              The superceding indictment was returned last week I
8
  ||believe --
9
              THE COURT: January 30 according to the copy that I
10
  have.
11
              MR. TEEM: Right, last week. And Mr. Lee obviously
12
  was aware of that. The -- today's date was originally -- was I
   think was set for -- at some point it was set in and then it
13
  was postponed to accommodate the schedules of the officers I
   believe and maybe one of them was sick -- actually let me
15
16
  retract that.
17
              What had happened was we had gotten notice that the
18
  Grand Jury was going to return an indictment on a certain date
   and then was subsequently was revised by Mr. Crooks. And we
19
20
   thanked him for the notice that that date was postponed because
   the testifying officer was ill and needed to get better.
21
22
              And so there was further delay. Mr. Lee was advised
  of that. There was ample opportunity knowing the -- knowing
  what was coming down the pike for Mr. Lee to flee. He didn't.
   Today was arranged by agreement between me and Mr. Crooks
```

through a series of e-mails late last week. So Mr. Lee was aware that today was the day.

The opportunity to leave existed even if the Court doesn't want to consider the 11 months since the search, certainly was out there as of the 2nd of January and Mr. Lee is here. So I think that is instructive, Your Honor. But in assessing the likelihood of any flight at all -- all right, but with respect to the posting of some kind of a surety if you will, I have spoken to Mr. Lee's father who is willing to post the family home at 2212 Week(sic) Lane in Silver Spring.

It has a -- obviously we don't have the documentation in front of us, but Mr. Lee believes that the market value of that home is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1.3 million. He estimates that there is an existing mortgage of somewhere in the neighborhood of \$200,000. Which leaves -- I was not a math major but \$1.1 million potentially of equity in the home.

And that is willing to be -- he is willing to post that. I have also been told however, by pre-trial that it is not possible to do whatever it needs to do to verify or otherwise make functional on their end, the electronic monitor. Which the Court has indicated is going to be a requirement of any release.

24 And with that in mind, I would agree reiterate in 25 open court what I said on the record earlier, that I -- well

and pre-trial indicated that the reason that it can't be done is because of the hour of the day. There just isn't personnel available in Greenbelt where this would be monitored because of the southern division location, Montgomery County. There is no one available now to do that.

And we would urge the Court to reconsider what the Court indicated that the Court was likely to do and that is to hold Mr. Lee overnight. It is -- we would submit Your Honor, that is totally arbitrary. I mean the concern -- I guess implicit of that is that you have some concern that Mr. Lee might flee tonight. That going home with his father and brother, leaving his car here, giving me his car keys and spending the night with his family somehow gives him access to do tonight what he hasn't done for almost a year.

There is no evidence to suggest that at all. And I would submit to the Court that, one night in CDF is one night too many. If there is an alternative to that that is reasonable. And we would submit that there is. And so we would urge the Court to one, to accept the posting of the property that Mr. Lee the father is willing to post.

Let us know what we need to produce by way of documentation to satisfy the representations that I just made.

That there is value in the home that would be available. Allow Mr. Lee to go home with his father and brother to the house in Week Lane tonight to report back as early as the Court's

```
calendar would permit tomorrow and also to -- that would permit
   pre-trial to do whatever it needs to do to verify and otherwise
  make operational the electronic monitor.
3
4
              I -- you know, I -- it just seems to me totally
  illogical and arbitrary to believe that Mr. Lee has -- there is
5
  a risk that he is going to split tonight under those
7
  circumstances. He just doesn't have the wherewithal to do it.
  And he is in a location where people are kind of -- not kind of
9
   but people are promising to the Court under potentially pain of
10
   contempt if you will, that they will ensure that he is here
   tomorrow. And so we would ask that you allow that to happen.
11
12
              THE COURT: Just as a practical matter, I actually
   don't think he would need to come back to Court tomorrow, it
13
14
  would be -- pre-trial would be -- it is only if he is in
15
   custody then he would have to come back to Court to be
16
   released. But pre-trial is prepared to go attempt to hook up
17
   the equipment tomorrow morning?
18
                          That is my understanding, that both of
              MS. LARUE:
19
   the individuals in the Greenbelt that are specialized in that
20
   area will be available tomorrow. I don't know if they will
21
   have instructions for the defendant to go to that office first
22
   and then they will meet him at the house afterwards.
23
              THE COURT: What would you normally do?
24
              MS. LARUE: It depends on what specialists prefers
          So without them being available right now, I can't ask
```

them what their preference would be.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Crooks what is your position?

MR. CROOKS: Your Honor, I -- as Your Honor has

pointed out based on juxtaposing where we stand on this case

and similar cases. What we are -- the Government is agreeing

to is already a gross anomaly and I think that -- I think -- I

already know that there is colleagues for a bit of a jaundiced

eye why I am taking the stance that I am agreeing to

conditions, I mean, agreeing to release in any conditions.

But that being said as a background, I agree with the Court's sentiments that you expressed before we recessed that the prudent thing to do is to make sure that all of the conditions are present that will ultimately be present. And it is not to try to punish the defendant and send him to CDF for a night. That being said, you know, there are countless defendants that I have sent opposite this table that don't have the means and the familial support but the same dynamics are in to play and no exceptions are made for those individuals until the proper conditions are established what the Court would deem fit.

And I think in this context, it is fair to -- it is fair to make -- the Court to mandate that those conditions that ultimately we would set are set. And I don't make that cavalierly also. I think that a lot has been made about the time frame but also the nature of the offense. On the

defendant's computer were not just the fabricated documents that are mentioned in the indictment, the -- that is the driver's license.

Right after the search warrants, his passport, defense counsel asked for his passport back and I explained to them that we couldn't return that passport because we believe it has an evidentiary value because it did appear that it was also being used as a template for counterfeit document.

In addition, it appears that his CPA license and the grades that he earned as a CPA were photoshopped and modified and he changed the grade to having where it appeared that he had failed his CPA, he changed it to have passed it. We saw false graduate degrees that he had created. I am not trying to stack the deck here but I want to say this is someone who has shown the capability. And sometime the net effect of the first arraignment -- I am sorry the first initial appearance where you actually hear the charges that now are pending in light of the fact that we have reached an impasse in the negotiations.

Again it is going to be -- I credit the defense, it might be a very long 12 to 24 hours for the defendant but that is short compared to the time frame that the public has an interest in accounting for which is what we will be the lead up to trial.

And I think those are the conditions that the Government is supportive of and we agree that or we advocate for all of those

24

25

conditions to be in place before the defendant is released. 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 Well, the fact that Mr. Lee has had MR. TREEM: 4 opportunities that other s may not have had, as of reason to 5 treat him otherwise than what we would argue makes sense here, I find somewhat offensive. But the fact remains that 7 regardless of what might have been on Mr. Lee's computer, he 8 doesn't have it anymore. 9 He won't have access to his parent's computer 10 because that is password protected. He doesn't have the 11 To suggest that he is going to be able to some how 12 put together false documents overnight and get out of town is 13 nonsensical. It justifies all logic and reason. 14 We are not asking for the Court to give him free reign. We have made our record on what we think is an 15 16 appropriate bond condition, the Court has indicated what the 17 Court is willing to do in that regard. EM being 24/7 and we 18 will live with that and maybe we will appeal or not. But we understand that condition. 19 20 What we are suggesting to the Court now is simply let him go home with his father, to come here to report to you 21 22 tomorrow. And be released upon pre-trial doing its job

tomorrow morning, getting someone to the house or doing whatever it is that they have to do and so advising the Court.

That is all we are asking for. It is -- you know,

15 hours of free time if you will. And that in light of everything else, doesn't seem to me to be either unreasonable to request nor is there evidence to suggest that it shouldn't be granted. Your Honor, so we would reiterate what we have requested in that regard.

But there is one other point that I want to -actually a question. What happens if pre-trial can't get this
done tomorrow?

THE COURT: Oh, pre-trial will get it done tomorrow.

One way or the other. Hopefully somebody in Greenbelt can do

it, if not then somebody else will do it. I don't think that

is an issue.

MR. TREEM: Okay. Okay. Well and the other question is, Your Honor, if the Court is willing to accept a property that we suggested -- what would the Court need to verify ownership and value and need?

THE COURT: Let me say first is that I think the property offered is adequate and significant. And obviously Dr. Lee's willingness and I assume perhaps -- is the property held jointly in Dr. Lee and his wife's name? Just -- yes, joint ownership? So they both will need to sign the paperwork for that.

But obviously their willingness to post it is significant in my mind in terms of its adequacy. So, I think you know, first you would have to have both Dr. Lee and Ms. Lee

sign the bond -- you know, posting the property. I would issue an order to record the agreement to forfeit the property and the land records in Montgomery County.

We usually ask that that be done within a couple of days of the hearing here. And typically there has to be some offer of proof of ownership of the property. Be it the deed and I don't now how much -- what evidence -- I have traditionally been flexible in terms of evidence of value on the property. Not everybody has a current assessment. But maybe there was a property assessment and then what is left, a --- reflection of what is left on the mortgage so.

Presumably you could put that together with documents that they are likely to have as opposed to having to go create a document. But I -- on that issue I do accept a proffer that there is significant value in the property subject to the confirmation so I think that is adequate.

Let me just say, it is certainly reasonable -perfectly understandable why you Mr. Treem would ask for
release on Mr. Lee's behalf. And you have noted a number of
factors in his favor. Frankly all of what, I think, rebut the
presumption in favor of detention and a case that otherwise -say reasonable minds may differ. You may debate the reasonable
part of that but minds may differ as to what the conditions of
release are appropriate.

But the question for me is if the conditions of

release are appropriate, then they are appropriate. They are appropriate to be in place. Not 15 hours from now or two days from now or three days from now and it is with very few exceptions, my general practice that if I am setting conditions of release along these lines and this restrictive, that release is not allowed until the conditions are in place. I have every faith that pre-trial is going to make this happen tomorrow.

It sounds as though pre-trial got additional information that the phone is suitable, that the conditions have been -- the special features have been removed and I know that Ms. LaRue will make sure that somebody is able to do that. So I am prepared to set conditions of release, go over those with Mr. Lee and Dr. Lee, make sure he understands his obligations. We can get all of the paperwork signed today and then have Mr. Lee brought back here tomorrow for further direction from pre-trial as to whether to go home or have the pre-trial services officer meet with him.

And then I think -- I am not sure we need another hearing. Just in terms, the other loose end would be the -- having the deed and establishing the general fact of value on the property. And I guess I think probably to obviate the need for a hearing, I would ask pre-trial and the Government to review that documentation together with Mr. Treem and then I will accept that as a general representation by all involved, that there is substantial equity.

I understand that it may not be down to the penny of what we discussed but it certainly sounds as though there is substantial equity in the property. So, Dr. Lee, I am going to make you a third party custodian of your son. And I think there is probably already -- you were already spoken to about what that entails. First and foremost, he would be residing with you in your home on 24/7 electronic monitoring except for leave that is approved in advance. And I am going to go over the details of the release.

But in terms of your obligations, you would use your best efforts to make sure that he appears for any future court proceedings, he complies with any release conditions and if he were to violate the release conditions, you would be required to notify the Court immediately. Do you understand that those would be your obligations?

DR. LEE: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: There is a spot for you to sign on this paperwork, I am going to go over what all of the conditions are, if you have any questions for me when I am done, I would be happy to try to answer them for you. If not then there is going to be a spot for you to sign. And as we discussed, I understand that you are willing to post your home in Silver Spring. And so there is paperwork that you will have to sign in that regard and I just want to make sure that you understand what that means.

```
1
              You are signing an appearance bond -- sir? Yes?
2
              DR. LEE: --- documentation ---
3
              THE COURT: I am sorry, I can't hear you?
4
              DR. LEE: --- option --
5
              MR. TEEM: Your Honor, if it makes a difference in
   terms of Mr. Lee, Jr. being released today, Dr. Lee can give
7
  you a check for what would otherwise be the value of the house?
8
              THE COURT: I appreciate that offer. It won't
9
  change the dynamics today and I am confident that we can get
10
   the paperwork tomorrow, so that won't be the posting of your
  property won't be a holdup for tomorrow in terms of his
11
12
  release. So but what the appearance bond and agreement to
13
  forfeit property means is that by posting your property, if
  your son were to violate any of his release conditions or not
15
   appear for either a court appearance or to serve a sentence if
16
   the case got to that point, then you would -- the Government
17
   would have the right to forfeit your home.
18
              And that is the most notable thing that I want to
19
   make sure you understand and that you are willing to post the
20
   property under those circumstances. Are you?
21
              DR. LEE: Yes ---
22
              THE COURT: Okay.
23
              DR. LEE: --- cash, I can write the check for you
24
   or ---
25
              THE COURT: Yes, thank you for that offer.
```

doesn't change my position. So and I do think the posting of the property is a significant part of the conditions of release that I am fashioning. I may go over those conditions of release with your son and if I could ask you to please listen as well if you have any questions for me when I am done, as I said I would be happy to try to answer them for you. Thank you.

Mr. Lee, I am going to release you. The conditions of release are important to understand and comply with for a couple of reasons. Most notably, if you violate your release conditions, you run the very substantial risk that you will be held in custody pending your trial. In addition, you could be -- if you violate your release conditions, you could be prosecuted separately for the violation of your release conditions. And depending on what the nature of the violation were, that could be -- subject you to prosecution for an offense that carries a penalty for up to ten years incarceration and \$250,000 fine just for the violation itself.

While you are on release, you are not to violate any Federal, state or local law. You are going to be expected to reside at your parents' home in Silver Spring. You agree to appear for any court appearances. If the case got to the point where a sentence was imposed, you would agree to appear to serve your sentence.

Your father is going to be your third party

custodian. You heard me go over his obligations with him and I trust that you are not going to put him in a difficult position of having to notify the Court of any type of violations. You are going to report on a regular basis to pre-trial services, following any reasonable instruction or direction they give to you.

As you also heard, your father is going to post -your father and your mother are going to post property -- their
home in Silver Spring as -- in support of your release. And
you understand that if you violate the release conditions, they
run the risk that they lose that home.

I understand that your passport is already in the possession of law enforcement. If you have any other passports, you are required to turn them in immediately. You are not to obtain any new passport. You are going to -- as I said, reside at the address that we have approved. You are not to change that unless you get approval in advance from pretrial services and the Court.

Your travel will be restricted to Maryland for purposes of what I am about to get to in a moment. You will undergo any medical or psychiatric treatment or counseling that pre-trial determines is appropriate. You are to refrain from any excessive use of alcohol. You are to refrain from any use or unlawful possession of any narcotic drug or controlled substance unless a doctor prescribes it to you.

And you will submit to any testing or treatment for any type of substance -- controlled substances that pre-trial determines is appropriate. You are going to be placed on electronic monitoring and basically restricted to your residence except for leave approved in advance by pre-trial services.

For medical appearances, medical purposes, court appearances, meetings with counsel or other activities that are specifically approved by the Court. You are to refrain from the use of any type of computer system or internet capable device or similar electronic devices at any location and at your parents' home. I understand that they may have computers there, Mr. Treem has represented that those are password protected. Is that true of all of the devices there, Mr. Treem?

MR. TEEM: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, so you are not to possess them independently and obviously not to access any of them in the home. You are not to have any contact with any minors unless you are in the presence of either your third party custodian or other individual that is approved by the Court or pre-trial services in advance. Do you understand the conditions that I have gone over Mr. Lee?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And I will let you review these with

```
Mr. Treem and if you have any questions for me, I will be happy
   to try to answer them for you.
3
              MS. LARUE: Your Honor?
4
              THE COURT: Yes?
5
              MS. LARUE: Regarding the conditions and you may
  have said it and I did not hear it, but pre-trial would
7
  recommend that he not have any contact with the victim -- the
   alleged victim or witnesses as well as not possess any --
9
              THE COURT: Yes, I didn't say that but yes that
10
  should be -- would you mind giving that back to me, Mr. Treem.
  It is a fairly standard condition, Mr. Lee. You are not to
11
12
  have any contact with the individual identified in count 1 of
   the indictment or with any potential witnesses in the case.
13
  And obviously the Government should share any information that
   they have in that regard so that Mr. Lee knows who that covers.
15
16
              MS. LARUE: And Your Honor, pre-trial would also
   recommend that he not possess or view any pornography
17
18
   throughout the pendency of this case. And I believe consistent
19
   with what we generally recommend in the Adam Walsh Statute that
   there is a firearms restriction as well.
20
21
              MR. TEEM: I miss the last --
22
              THE COURT: Firearms restriction? Is there any --
  no possession of any -- so Mr. Lee, you are not to possess any
  firearm, destructive device or dangerous weapon and you are not
24
   to possess any pornography during the pendency of this case?
25
```

```
You understand those additional --
2
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
3
              THE COURT: Okay.
4
              (Pause.)
5
              THE COURT: Ms. Larue, I wonder if it makes more
  sense to do a come up for Mr. Lee to the Greenbelt courthouse?
7
              MS. LARUE:
                          I don't know that it makes a difference
  either way and I don't know what the logistics are behind that
9
   as to if that is possible. That may or may not postpone what
10
  time he might be released.
11
              THE COURT: Say that again?
12
              MS. LARUE:
                          That may or may not postpone what time
13
  he might be released because if he is taken to CDF tonight,
   then obviously would need to be transported at some point in
   time to --
15
16
              THE COURT: Would you prefer that --
17
                         I am sorry I missed the question --
              MR. TEEM:
18
                          The question is whether to bring Mr. Lee
              THE COURT:
   back here or to the Greenbelt courthouse? What is your
19
20
   preference?
21
                         I think -- I guess whatever is easiest
              MR. TEEM:
   and faster which I think would be here.
23
              THE COURT: That is probably here. Yes, that is --
24
              MR. TEEM: I mean, I don't want to get him caught in
25
   the switches of the marshals having to --
```

in jail for a second night.

```
THE COURT: Then we will just do that. Because I am
 1
  thinking also that -- well, Dr. Lee is here and able to sign
  the agreement to forfeit property and his wife is going to have
3
  to sign it at some point. I am okay with arranging that
   through pre-trial. So I don't know what is more convenient for
5
         She can either come here tomorrow to do it or can do it
7
  with --
8
              MR. TEEM: I quess it is probably easier if Mr. Lee
9
  is going to be in fact be released at the time that his father
10
   and mother come here to execute whatever needs to be executed,
   it is probably easier to do it -- everything here. Can I have
11
12
   a moment?
13
              THE COURT: Sure.
14
              (Pause.)
15
              MR. TEEM: It never works quite as smoothly as one
  would hope, Your Honor. Mrs. Lee is currently in California.
   She is not going to be able to get back to Maryland until late
17
              I would like to get my client out tomorrow if that
18
19
   is possible. So there are a couple of things that come to
   mind.
20
21
              If we can whatever documents need to be signed,
  Mrs. Lee can provide e-mail signatures I am sure, that is kind
23
  of one possible alternative. We can have her here on Friday,
  that is another possibility. I would like my client not to be
```

Third as Dr. Lee has just advised me, he is prepared to give the clerk of the court with a check which -- to kind of cover the time it takes Mrs. Lee to get here. Just as kind of an assurance that she will show up on Friday to execute whatever documents need to be executed.

THE COURT: Okay, here is what I would suggest is perhaps we can have pre-trial talk to Mrs. Lee tomorrow and confirm her willingness to post the property. And you can facilitate that Mr. Treem and then make arrangements for her to sign the paperwork by Friday. I don't think it is necessary to have that. I think having the electronic monitoring in place addresses that. So I think that is adequate.

MR. TEEM: Should I arrange that through Ms. Larue or through --

THE COURT: I would until further notice, I think

Ms. Larue is going to be doing this or figuring out who is

doing it. So I think she is probably the person to -- we are

going to do a come up for tomorrow morning at 9:00 and so that

will give you the hopefully plenty of time to get everything

squared away tomorrow.

And it may be that -- so Mr. Lee, pardon me, Dr. Lee can sign the appearance bond today and then you could probably have Mrs. Lee sign it in Greenbelt, right?

MS. LARUE: I would imagine so, Your Honor, as long as we can keep the originals and then send that back to the

```
Court --
2
              THE COURT: Yes, so it may be easier for her to
3
  appear in Greenbelt and sign the paperwork there.
4
              MR. TEEM:
                        Okay.
5
              THE COURT: But I think that is -- as long as we
  know that she is okay with it. Which I am sure she is, but
7
   since this is sort of a new development, I think that is
8
   adequate.
9
              MR. TEEM: Okay, fine, Your Honor.
10
              (Pause.)
11
              THE COURT: And Mr. Treem, let me give you also the
  agreement to forfeit property for Dr. Lee and this is what we
13
  will get Mrs. Lee to sign. And you know, the last question I
   should ask you, is normally once this is signed and I would ask
   that the agreement to forfeit property which I just handed you,
15
  be filed in the Montgomery County records.
17
              Given that Mrs. Lee probably won't sign it until
18
   Friday, I was going to say that that be done on Monday, the
19
  10th?
20
              MR. TEEM:
                        Yes.
21
                          Then I am going to put that -- I will
              THE COURT:
  give you a copy of this so that it will be done by the 10th of
23
  February.
24
              MR. CROOKS: And Your Honor, while they are looking
  at that, I have an administrative function, which is just I
25
```

```
meant and would like to move to unseal the original indictment
   which was returned on January 2, 2014.
3
                          The original indictment?
              THE COURT:
4
              MR. CROOKS:
                          Right.
5
              THE COURT: Is it superceding --
6
              MR. CROOKS:
                           It is superceding and Your Honor may
7
  recall, it is sort of a confusing return, the superceding
  indictment was unsealed but I think for the way it stands now,
9
   the original is sealed, so I am just moving to have that
   unsealed.
10
11
              THE COURT: Okay, I think you probably also need to
12
  file a motion at this point.
13
              MR. CROOKS: Okay.
14
                          But for purposes of this proceeding, we
              THE COURT:
15
  will unseal it and just follow it up with a motion.
16
              MR. CROOKS: Okay, great. Thank you.
17
              (Pause.)
18
              THE COURT: Okay, so Dr. Lee I see you signed both
19
   the appearance bond as well as the conditions of release. You
20
   understand the conditions?
21
              DR. LEE: Yes.
22
              THE COURT: And Mr. Lee, I see you have signed the
   conditions of the release, you understand them as well?
24
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
25
              THE COURT: Okay. So again we will do the come up
```

```
for tomorrow morning and pre-trial will be in touch with the
  marshal service and make arrangements and give Mr. Lee
  direction as to where to go and hopefully by then they will
  have the name of the person who is going to put the equipment
  into place tomorrow.
5
6
              MR. TEEM: So he will be brought to the courthouse
7
   first?
8
              THE COURT: He will be brought here.
9
              MR. TEEM:
                         Okay.
10
                          And typically -- Ms. Larue can tell you
              THE COURT:
  more detail. But I think when she goes to the marshal service
11
  and says that the conditions are being met and he can be
   released, that that will happen.
13
14
              MR. TEEM: I mean, either Ms. Levinson or I will be
15
  here as well.
16
              THE COURT: Yes, you might check -- you don't have
17
  to be but obviously you are welcome to but put the 9:00 on the
   come up, I don't know if he will be here exactly then.
18
19
   may be optimistic of me, that is an early come up but I wanted
20
   to do it as early as possible.
21
                        I appreciate that, Your Honor and I will
              MR. TEEM:
22
  draw on my past experience to get here at some point --
23
              THE COURT: And you can always stop by the marshal
  service on your way out and ask them whether that is realistic.
25
   So -- okay, so I think the only additional issues that have to
```

```
be done is have Mrs. Lee signed this paperwork by Friday. Give
  information to pre-trial about the property ownership and the
  value. We will give you a copy of all of this including the
3
  agreement to post or to file the agreement to forfeit property
5
  by Monday.
6
              MR. TEEM: And I will have Mrs. Lee get in touch
7
  with Ms. Larue.
8
              THE COURT:
                          Yes. Okay. Is there anything else?
9
              MR. CROOKS: No, Your Honor, thank you.
10
              (Whereupon, the hearing concluded.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```


I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

/s/ Gail A. Williams
Gail A. Williams
Certified Transcriber
Certificate No. CET**D-434

February 19, 2014

Date

61

/s/ Lisa Contreras

Lisa Contreras Certified Transcriber Certificate No. CET**D-474 February 19, 2014

Date